OFFICE OF THE PRINCIPAL INFORMATION OFFICER TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE, OLD PUBLIC OFFICES, BANGALORE.

Press Note.

Food Offences in the areas of Bangalore Corporation and Mysore City during the month of January 1952.

I. BANGALORE CORPORATION AREA.

1. For unauthorised transport of rationed food articles, four persons of Bangalore City were sentenced to undergo simple imprisonment till the rise of the court with fines ranging from Rs. 2 to Rs. 25.

2. For running unauthorisedly a sweetmeat stall, a person of the City was convicted and sentenced to undergo S.I. till the rising of the court and to pay a fine of Rs. 15.

3. A Licensee of IX Division, Bangalore City, was administered a warning for issuing full rations on 2 ration cards in one rice contrary to instructions and for making certain excess issues.

4. Two Licensees of IV Division and V Division of the City were administered warnings for having issued invalid cheques.

5. A Licensee of I Division, Bangalore City, was fined Rs 100 for misappropriation of certain rationed grains, besides levy of penal rate for the quantity involved therein.

6. A ration dealer of IX Division, Bangalore City, was fined Rs. 50 for issue of 30 seers of rice to a person off ration card.

7. A Licensee of IV Division of the City was fined Rs. 25 for certain irregularities, such as reducing shortages without orders, late opening of the ration shop, etc.

8. A fire-wood Licensee of IX Division, Bangalore City, was administered a warning for not taking delivery of allotments for three weeks.

9. For unauthorised transport of rationed foodgrains, 13 persons of the City were convicted and sentenced to pay fines ranging from Rs. 15 to Rs. 40.

10. For running catering establishments without authority, three persons of the City were sentenced to pay fines ranging from Rs. 15 to Rs. 25.

11. Two licensed foodgrains dealers of II Division, Bangalore City, were convicted and sentenced to pay fines of Rs. 300 and Rs. 100, respectively, for selling rationed foodgrains off ration document.

12. A Licensee of VII Division and two Co-operative Societies in VI Division and III Division, respectively, were administered warnings for various irregularities observed.

13. For shortages observed with them, a licensee of VII Division, Bangalore City and two of I and IV Divisions of Civil Area were administered warnings, besides levying penal rates.

II. MYSORE CITY.

1. For transports of paddy without valid permits three persons were convicted and sentenced to suffer S.I. till the rising of the court with fines of Rs. 10, Rs. 35 and Rs. 10, respectively.

2 Three Ration Depot Licensees were fined Rs. 10, Rs. 10 and Rs. 5, respectively, for issuing cheques towards commodities supplied to them without sufficient funds at credit in the Bank.

3. Two Licensees were severely warned for issuing excess rations.

4 For not opening the depot in time, a depot Licensee was fined Rs. 2.

5. A Licensee of I Division and another of II Division were surcharged for shortages of 12 and 13 seers of rice shown by them.

6. For having issued cheques towards commodities supplied to them without sufficient funds at their credit in the Bank, a Co-operative Society of III Division was fined Rs. 5, two Licensees of II Circle were fined Rs. 50 and Rs. 25, respectively, and two Licensees of I Circle were fined Rs. 50 each.

(P.N. No. 310—1-3-1952)

Press Note.

Return of Election Expenses.

The return of election expenses has to be lodged with the Returning Officer in respect of each person, who has been nominated as a candidate within 45 days from the date of publication in the official Gazette of the Returning Officers' Declaration, containing the names of the elected candidates. The form in which this return should be filed is printed and kept for sale for the use of candidates at the Government Central Book Depot. Doubts have been raised in some quarters whether persons whose nominations have been rejected or who withdrew their nominations before the time fixed for the purpose have also to file the return of election expenses. The rules are clear and the return of election expenses should be filed even in respect of those persons whose nominations have been rejected or who withdrew their nominations before the time fixed for the purpose.

The attention of the persons filing this return of election expenses is also in this connection invited to Schedule IV of the Representation of the People (Conduct of Elections and Election Petitions) Rules, 1951, which gives instructions about the manner of filing up the form and to the declarations by the candidate and his election agent to be made on oath or solemn affirmation before a magistrate and filed along with this return (the form of declaration is given in the Schedule) written on papers stamped with non-judicial stamps on the value of Rs. 2 each.

(P.N. No. 311—1-3-1952).

Press Note.

Census Figures and Sample Verification.

Though it has always been recognised that no Census can be a hundred per cent correct, every Census in the past has claimed to be more accurate than its predecessors. This claim has never been put to test, however, or demonstrated in figures, even when there was good reason to believe that extraneous causes had vitiated the Census count. As a departure from this practice (and following the recommendations of the United Nations Organisation) the general population Census of Mysore, taken in March last year, was followed up six months later by an enquiry designed to verify, scientifically, and, on the basis of a randum sample of households, the accuracy of the figures gathered at the census. The Census Commissioner for Mysore has reviewed this operation in a report published in December 1951, entitled "Sample Verification of the Census Count." So far as Mysore was concerned such an objective verification was most desirable, because the latest count had registered such a big rise in the State's population during the previous decade that it was suspected that a good part of the increase must have been due to wilful inflation of numbers. Now that the Census figures have been verified, it is possible to dispel all suspicions and to know exactly how close we are, or how distant, from the ideal of a perfect Census.

Under the scheme of verification, nearly 130 Verification Officers, almost all of whom were Magistrates, were deputed to visit a perfectly randum sample of households chosen from the total mass of households enumerated at the Census, to see in each household how many persons were enumerated in excess and how many erroneously omitted from the count; and, in addition, to ascertain in how many instances, if any, entire houses had slipped through the Census net due to the failure of the Census Enumerator to cover them. The sample comprised of nearly a thousand households; and three times as many houses were checked for coverage. Skilfully designed safeguards were built into the procedure of verification to ensure that neither the verifiers nor the verified had any opportunity for dishonesty, and only genuine cases of erroneous enumeration were taken into the final reckoning. The results obtained for the sample furnished estimates in respect of the total population.

The single, most important, conclusion drawn from the results is that the nett error in the count is one of under-enumeration and not over-enumeration. In other words, though there is some distortion in Census figures, the distortion has neither the direction nor the degree that it was expected to have. Happily, therefore, census figures have not been marred by any wilful inflation of numbers. However, according to anticipation, mis-enumeration was